

LUCIFER.



THE LIGHT-BEARER.

PRICE 5 CENTS.

CHICAGO, ILL., FEB. 11, E. M. 304. [C. E. 1904.]

WHOLE NO. 1007

THE EVOLUTION OF MODESTY.

BY JONATHAN MAYO CRANE.

Why do people wear clothes?

"To keep themselves warm. Ask us something hard," replies the Cheerful Idiot.

"Because Eve ate the apple," answers the Theological Student, unaware of the fact that the Bible does not tell what the "forbidden fruit" was.

"Clothing," remarks the Professor, "is designed not only to protect the body from extremes of heat and cold but it is also intended to conceal certain parts of the body which decency requires us to keep covered. Therefore clothing is necessary to preserve modesty and enable us easier to repress our animal propensities. It is clothing that distinguishes man from other animals. It is the badge of our moral natures. It is necessary for the preservation of morality and the advancement of civilization. Some savages wear little or no clothing, but all such people are little above animals in their ideas of modesty and morality."

The Professor voices the generally prevailing sentiment regarding the reason why people wear clothes. By millions of persons nudity is considered immodest and the concealment of portions of the body with clothing is regarded as necessary for purity of thought and the repression of sexual attraction. But, paradoxical as it may seem, an examination of the facts in the case will prove that the wearing of clothes—this intentional concealment of parts of the human body—has exactly the opposite effect. It follows, then, if thoughts concerning the sexual relations are immodest, the wearing of clothes stimulates immodesty.

"Modesty," says Dr. Havelock Ellis, "may be provisionally defined as an almost instinctive fear prompting concealment, and usually centering around the sexual processes." He refers here particularly to sexual modesty, for there are other forms of modesty which are closely allied to bashfulness, coyness, reserve and diffidence. For instance a modest man is one who shrinks from notoriety or publicity. What I intend to discuss particularly is sex modesty, which is expressed better by the French word *pudeur*, and not so well indicated by the English word *pudicity*, derived from the Latin word *pudeo*, which means "I am ashamed." A person may be ashamed of his horse, of his country, etc., but the meaning of *pudeo* is sexual shame; hence we have the word *pudenda*, meaning the sexual organs, indicating that these organs are shameful or are the seat of shame. From this word *pudeo* we also have the word *impudent*, which in its primary sense means shameless but is now used almost exclusively in the sense of immodest, with no reference to sex, or as a synonym for audacious, over-bold, too forward, or of the more slangy expressions cheeky, fresh, nervy or full of gall.

In whatever sense the word *modesty* is used it indicates a shrinking or reluctant impulse which can hardly be said to amount in all cases to fear. In other words, it is a sensitive regard for the opinions of other persons. But even this definition is not exact, for a person may have a feeling of modesty when absolutely alone. There are many persons who cannot look upon their own nude bodies without a feeling of shame—a feeling of self-disapproval. So it would seem that modesty implies a repugnance to disapproval, whether it be self-disapproval or disapproval likely to be incurred from others. At bottom, however, it is a repugnance toward self-disapproval, for often we may see modest persons bravely and voluntarily enduring the disapproval of others, but their ability to do so

comes from their own self-approval. In fact, such persons are the most genuinely modest, because they are pure-minded. Hence the saying, "To the pure all things are pure."

The common idea that clothing is essential to modesty is disproved by the fact that there are many races of people who go absolutely naked and yet are extremely modest. Somerville, in the *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, 1897, page 394, says: "The New Georgians of the Solomon Islands, so low a race that they are ignorant of both pottery and weaving and wear only a loincloth, have the same ideas of what is decent with regard to certain acts and exposures that we ourselves have."

Klemm says of the Naga women of Assam: "Of clothing there was not much to see, but in spite of this I doubt whether we could excel them in true decency and modesty. . . . The Naga women only cover their breasts. They declare that it is absurd to cover those parts of the body which everyone has been able to see from their births, but that it is different with the breasts, which appeared later, and are, therefore, to be covered. . . . In the presence of strangers the Naga women simply cross their arms over their breasts, without caring much what other charms they may reveal to the observer."

It may be that the maternal instinct in woman prompts her involuntarily to conceal her breasts. Although a partial or almost complete exposure of the breasts is permitted by the décolleté costumes of fashionable ladies in so-called civilized countries, nevertheless the instinct to cover the breast seems to be stronger and more quickly asserted than the instinct to conceal any other part of the body. Gessner tells of a woman, clothed only in a chemise, who, on being surprised by the unexpected appearance of a man, quickly caught up the front of the garment and covered her breast and face with it, leaving exposed all of her person below. And he asserts that this instinct to cover the breasts is primary and that the covering of the public region is the result of second thought. This primary instinct, however, he argues, is not the result of a feeling of shame, but is a natural impulse for the protection of the maternal fount. Hence he deduces the idea that the sense of shame is not innate, but is acquired. This opinion seems to be shared by Stendhal who, in "De l'Amour," chapter xxvi, says: "It is clear that three parts of modesty are taught." And he adds: "The evil of modesty is that it constantly leads to falsehood."

It must be apparent to any observer that nakedness is not necessarily associated with a feeling of shame. Every mother knows how natural it is for children to expose their persons and how difficult it is to teach them that they must keep some parts of their persons concealed. Children are natural logicians and they see no reason why one part of the body should be concealed more than another. To tell them that to expose their persons "is naughty" or "isn't nice" does not appeal to their logical minds; they want to know why it is "naughty." And it is that word "why" which is a terror to all conventional people. Yet that word "why" is the symbol of intellectual progress, the key note of the desire for knowledge. The independent mind asks why one thing should be permitted and another forbidden. Those enslaved by tradition and convention say:

"Ours not to question why;
Ours but to do and die."

That ideas of modesty are not innate, but are the result of education and environment, is shown by the fact that these ideas vary in different countries and in different periods of time.

"A woman in some parts of Asia," von Humboldt says, "is not permitted to show the ends of her fingers, while an Indian of the Caribbean race is far from considering herself naked when she wears a 'guajuco' two inches broad. Even this band is regarded as a less essential part of dress than the pigment which covers the skin. To go out of the hut without being painted with arnotta is to transgress all rules of Caribbean decency."

In Tahiti, Lubbock says, a person not properly tattooed would be "as much reproached and shunned as if with us he should go about the streets naked." In fact, tattooing has almost universally preceded the wearing of clothes by men and women. Darwin, in "The Descent of Man," says: "Not one great country can be named, from the polar regions in the north to New Zealand in the south, in which the aborigines do not tattoo themselves." Herodotus says tattooing was practiced by the ancient Assyrians, Britons and Thracians. Westermarck, in his "History of Human Marriage," says no exposed part of the human body, except the eye ball, has escaped tattoo marks. The Abyssinian women tattoo their gums. The Mundrucus of Brazil tattoo even their eyelids. Some of the Sandwich Islanders tattoo the ends of their tongues.

If we can discover the reason for the almost universal prevalence of the custom of tattooing, we may infer why men and women began to wear clothing in countries where the climate is not severe enough to require covering for the body. Some ethnographers think the tattoo is of religious origin. Professor Gerland holds that the tattoo marks originally were figures of totem animals, though they are no longer so. Westermarck says: "An assumption of that kind is not permissible in a scientific investigation." In other words, proof is required, rather than a mere assumption. Totemism, it may be remarked, is a sort of primitive animistic religion universally prevalent among savages. (See "Totemism" and "Animism" in the Encyclopædia Britannica.) Continuing, Westermarck says: "Even in those rare cases where a connection between tattooing and totemism undoubtedly exists, we can not be sure whether this connection is not secondary. At present tattooing is everywhere regarded exclusively, or almost exclusively, as a means of decoration, and Cook states expressly that, in the South Sea Islands, at the time of their discovery, it was in no way connected with religion. Nor can I agree with Mr. Spencer that tattooing and other kinds of mutilation were practiced originally as a means of expressing subordination to a dead ruler or a god. Equally without evidence is Mr. Colquhoun's opinion that the custom originated in the wish either, to make a man more fearful in battle, or to render the body invulnerable by the tattooing of charms on it. . . . I do not deny, either, that men may sometimes paint their bodies in order to inspire their enemies with fear in battle, or that the use of red ochre and fat is good as a defense against changes of weather, flies and mosquitoes. Nevertheless, it seems to be beyond doubt that men and women began to ornament, mutilate, paint and tattoo themselves chiefly in order to make themselves attractive to the opposite sex—that they might court successfully, or be courted. It is noteworthy that in all parts of the world the desire for self-decoration is strongest at the beginning of the age of puberty."

When Mertens asked the natives of Lukunor what was the meaning of tattooing, one of them answered: "It has the same object as your clothes—that is, to please the women."

Facts seem to prove that sexual selection, which plays such an important part in evolution and the perpetuation of life, originated modesty. If this theory is true, modesty must be found in other animals besides man. It has been observed that birds of prey hide themselves to drink, because they are obliged to plunge their heads under water. Birds of gay plumage evince a sense of shame after moulting. Coquetry, which is a form of modesty, is a common occurrence among dogs and many other animals.

"It is hard to find all the causes of modesty and shame," remarked Stanley Hall and Allin in the American Journal of Psychology, 1897, page 13, "but it is certain that very much of what is best in religion, art, and life owes its charm to the progressively widening irradiation of sexual feeling. Perhaps the reluctance of the female first long-circuited the exquisite sensations connected with sexual organs and acts to the antics of animals and human courtship, while restraint had the physiological function of developing the colors, plumes, excessive

activity and exuberant life of the pairing season. To keep certain parts of the body covered irradiated the sense of beauty to eyes, hair, face, complexion, dress, form, etc., while many savage dances, costumes, and postures are irradiations of the sexual act."

Who that has seen a cake walk given in first-class style has failed to notice its sexual significance? There is the proud strutting of the buck negro, almost in imitation of the barnyard rooster, the turkey gobbler or the fiery stallion. His female mate exhibits the coquetry, coyness and alluring advances and retreats which Audubon so well described in a passage regarding the courtship of skylarks.

So with regard to the decoration of the body, as by tattooing, painting, or the wearing of fine clothes, men and women seem to be impelled by a natural impulse to make themselves attractive. That this is part of the natural function of sexual selection is proved by the facts that children pay more attention to their personal appearance after reaching the age of puberty, and that the gay plumage of birds and the handsome coats of other animals are means to attract the opposite sex. Grant Allen, in "The New Hedonism," says:

"Every lovely object in organic nature owes its loveliness direct to sexual selection. The whole æsthetic sense in animals had this for its origin. Every spot on the feathery wings of butterflies was thus produced; every eye on the gorgeous glancing plumage of the peacock. The bronze and golden beetles, the flashing blue of the dragon-fly, the brilliant colors of tropical moths, the lamp of the glow-worm, the gleaming light of the firefly in the thicket, spring from the same source. The infinite variety of crest and gorget among the iridescent humming-birds; the glow of the trogon, the barbets among the palm-blossoms; the exquisite plumage of the birds of paradise; the ball-and-socket ornament of the argus pheasant; the infinite hues of parrot and macaw; the strange bill of the gaudy toucan, and the crimson wattles of the turkey, tell one story.

"The sun-birds deck themselves for their courtship in ruby and topaz, in chrysoprase and sapphire. Even the antlers of deer, the twisted horns of antelopes, and the graceful forms or dappled coats of so many other mammals have been developed in like manner by sexual selection. The very fish in the sea show similar results of æsthetic preferences. The butterfly fins of the gurnard and the courting colors of the stickleback have but one explanation.

"I need not elaborate this point; Darwin has already made it familiar to most of us. Throughout the animal world, almost every beautiful hue, almost every decorative adjunct is traceable in these 'lower' passions. Animals are pleasing to the eye just in proportion to the amount of æsthetic selection that their mates have exercised upon them; and they are most pleasing of all when most sexually vigorous, especially at the culminating point of the pairing season. Tennyson's familiar lines gain a new meaning when we read them thus, as illustrating the persistent thread of connection between the æsthetic sense in man and animals:

"In the spring a fuller crimson
Comes upon the robin's breast;
In the spring the wanton lapwing
Gets himself another crest:

"In the spring a livelier iris
Changes on the burnished dove;
In the spring a young man's fancy
Lightly turns to thoughts of love.

"Oddly enough, the same thing is true, against all probability, in the world of plants." And it is the same with fruits, he says. And then he adds significantly: "The coarse Puritan brain, accustomed to envisage sex as something to be ashamed of, will object at once in its prurient way: 'How horrid to think that in fruit and flower certain minds can see nothing but underlying sexuality!' In sober truth, the horridness lies all the other way—in looking upon sex, the mother of all things, as gross and degraded."

These quotations fairly prove, it seems to me, that natural decoration is due to sexual selection, the most beautiful creatures being the most successful in securing mates, thereby giving beauty to their offspring as an inheritance. In most animals and birds, however, the males are the most gaily decorated. Why, then, is it that among the human societies, females are considered the most vain and fond of fine apparel?

Investigation proves that women are not, by nature, more vain and fond of fine attire than men are. Among savage and barbarous peoples men are more given to decoration and adornment of their persons than women are. This is due to the fact

that the men do the courting and therefore they seek to make themselves attractive to the women. In civilization, however, the women are economically dependent upon men and it is to their interest to secure husbands; hence they bedeck themselves in finery in order to make themselves attractive to men. It is no refutation of this opinion to call attention to the fact that women who are economically independent and those who care nothing for men—such as "bachelor girls" who are celibates from choice—are also "good dressers." This seemingly incongruous fact is due to natural imitation and a love of beauty, which, as Grant Allen has shown, is the inherited result of selection on the part of their ancestors.

Instead of the custom of wearing clothes originating from a sense of shame at the exposure of the person, it appears that the sense of shame is due in great measure to the wearing of clothes. H. Crawford Angus, who spent many years in Central Africa, writes: "It has been my experience that the more naked the people and the more to us obscene and shameless in their manners and customs, the more moral and strict they are in matters of sexual intercourse." He describes the ceremony of initiating girls at puberty and adds: "The whole matter is looked upon as a matter of course, and not as a thing to be ashamed of or to hide, and being thus openly treated of and no secrecy made about it, you find in this tribe that the women are very virtuous. They know from the first all that is to be known, and cannot see any reason for secrecy concerning natural laws or the powers and senses that have been given them from birth."

Clement of Alexandria, one of the fathers of the Christian Church, wrote in his "Pedagogus," near the end of the second century: "Women will scarce strip naked before their own husbands, affecting a plausible pretense of modesty, but any others who may wish may see them at home shut up in their own baths. . . . The ancient athletes," he continues, "ashamed to exhibit a man naked, preserved their modesty by going through the contest in drawers; but these women, divesting themselves of their modesty along with their chemise, wish to appear beautiful, but contrary to their wish are simply proved to be wicked." Quoting this passage from Clement, Count Casanova, a century ago, remarked that "modesty, which seems so much more deeply rooted in women, only resides in the linen that covers them, and vanishes when it vanishes." The same idea is given expression by Chaucer, in his "Wife of Bath's Prologue," where he says:

"He sayde a woman cast hir sham away,
When she cast of hir smok."

As late as the middle of the seventeenth century nudity was common among the people of some parts of Ireland and with it was associated no thought of shame. Fynes Moryson, in his "Itinerary," part III, book III, chapter V, speaking of a visit to Cork in 1617, says: "I have seen with these eyes, young maids stark naked grinding corn with certain stones to make cakes thereof."

He tells of a Bohemian baron, just come from the north of Ireland, who "told me in great earnestness that he, coming to the house of Ocané, a great lord among them, was met at the door with sixteen women, all naked excepting their loose mantles; whereof eight or ten were very fair, and two seemed very nymphs; with which strange sight his eyes being dazzled they led him into the house, and then, sitting down by the fire with crossed legs like tailors, and so low as could not but offend chaste eyes, desired him to set down with them. Soon after Ocané, the lord of the country, came in, all naked excepting a loose mantle, and shoes, which he put off as soon as he came in, and entertaining the baron after his best manner in the Latin tongue, desired him to put off his apparel, which he thought to be a burthen to him, and to sit naked by the fire with this naked company. But the baron . . . for shame durst not put off his apparel."

That nudity is more chaste and less stimulating to the sexual passions than a partly draped human form is attested by the pictures and statuary in any art gallery. Wives of missionaries among savages, at first shocked by the scanty garments of the natives, soon become accustomed to it and go among them with no feeling of shame. Their own moral teaching, however, makes them oftentimes insist that the savages shall wear clothing, and thereby they unwittingly arouse a sense of shame where none existed before.

Nakedness must appear quite natural where all go nude. Wal-

lace, in his "Travels on the Amazon," says: "There is far more immodesty in the transparent and flesh-colored garments of our stage dancers than in the perfect nudity of these daughters of the forest."

Rowley, in his "Africa Unveiled," says: "When the sight becomes accustomed to the absence of raiment, your sense of propriety is far less offended than in England, where ample clothing is made the vehicle for asserting defiance, if not of actual law, yet of the wishes and feelings of the more virtuous part of the community."

Captain Snow, after his experience among the Fuegians, wrote: "More harm, I think, is done by false modesty—by covering and partly clothing—than by the truth in nature always appearing as it is. Intermingling with savages of wild lands who do not clothe gives one, I believe, less impure and sensual feelings than the merely mixing with society of a higher kind."

Havelock Ellis, "Psychology of Sex," vol. II, page 37, says that "modesty is in its origin independent of clothing, that physiological modesty takes precedence of anatomical modesty, and that the primary factors of modesty were probably developed long before the discovery of either ornaments or garments."

The truth of this observation depends on what Dr. Ellis means by the word modesty. The word as generally used is vague and almost impossible to define because modesty is an expression of a composite of numerous and complex emotions and it is perhaps impossible, or almost so, to identify all of these emotions. Undoubtedly self-consciousness is the base of the feeling of modesty, as it is of all other feelings. Feeling of any kind implies consciousness of that feeling and at the same time consciousness of self. So, although self-consciousness is the common starting point of all our feelings, this fact sheds no light on the psychological process by which our feelings are differentiated or diversified. This differentiation is due to the fact that all organisms tend to adapt themselves to their environments and that this tendency to adaptation is modified and greatly influenced by, and has its root in, the still stronger tendency to continue existence—the desire to live, the struggle for existence.

Sensation undoubtedly exists before consciousness, but feeling implies a consciousness of sensation. When the legs of a frog are cut off the muscles may be made to contract by the application of electricity to the nerves or by pricking the muscles with a needle. Physiologists call this reflex action, but the reflex action would not occur if the nerves were not sensitive to the stimulus applied. It cannot be said, however, that the legs of the frog feel the pain, for that would be the same as saying that the frog's legs are conscious. The photographer's dry plate is sensitive to the stimulus of light, but the dry plate does not feel. This carries sensation back to matter and force. Force sets matter in motion; therefore matter is sensitive to force.

With the consciousness of sensation come the feelings of pleasure and pain. Admitting that sexual selection is a dominating factor in the evolution of the species, it follows that there must be an impulse in sexed organisms to render themselves sexually attractive. When intelligence is associated with this impulse the creature discovers that sexual desire is stimulated to a degree by obstacles to its gratification. This is shown in many instances by an apparent reluctance on the part of the female, and right there seems to be the origin of modesty.

The natural reluctance, originating as a stimulant of sexual desire, sometimes becomes intensified into a genuine repugnance to sexual association. Where this repugnance is overcome by force the offspring tend to inherit the repugnance. But associated with the feeling of repugnance is also the inherited desire. The conflict of these two feelings tends to develop modesty still further. Thus it is known that there are many persons who have strong sexual desire associated with a notion that there is something wrong in gratifying it or in even harboring the desire. This, I think, explains what Dr. Ellis means by physiological modesty, the primary factors of which "were developed long before the discovery of either ornament or garment." In other words, modesty originally was mere reluctance, probably at first due to lack of desire, but afterwards utilized to stimulate desire.

Primitive man undoubtedly had his residence in the tropical regions, where clothes were unnecessary. Long after he had discovered the attractiveness of decorations, perhaps first by

CONTINUED ON PAGE 46.

LUCIFER.

THE LIGHT-BEARER.

MOSES HARMAN, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED EVERY WEEK AT 500 FULTON STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

Application. Filed for Entry at the Chicago Postoffice as Second-Class Mail Matter.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

One copy, one year.....\$2.00 One copy, six months.....\$1.00
Two copies to one address, one year.. 2.25 Two copies to one address, six mos.. 1.15
One copy, three months.....50 cents Single copies.....5 cents

Hereafter Lucifer will not be sent to subscribers after expiration of subscription except by special request. Please compare number on your wrapper with whole number of paper, and if your subscription is about to expire notify us if you wish to continue to receive Lucifer.

EASTERN REPRESENTATIVE:

E. C. WALKER, 244 WEST 143D STREET, NEW YORK CITY.

LUCIFER: ITS MEANING AND PURPOSE.

LUCIFER—The planet Venus; so called from its brightness.—Webster's Dictionary.

LUCIFEROUS—Giving light; affording light or the means of discovery.—Same.

LUCIFIC—Producing light.—Same.

LUCIFORM—Having the form of light.—Same.

The name Lucifer means Light-Bringing or Light-Bearing, and the paper that has adopted this name stands for Light against Darkness—for Reason against Superstition—for Science against Tradition—for Investigation and Enlightenment against Credulity and Ignorance—for Liberty against Slavery—for Justice against Privilege.

THIRD SERIES. VOLUME VIII. NO. 6.

CALIFORNIA NOTES.

One of the noteworthy events of my sojourn in San Francisco has been the Paine memorial meeting at Scottish Hall, on Friday, January 29. The large hall was well filled even to the galleries, with an attentive, well-behaved and enthusiastic audience. The programme was a long one, including speeches, recitations, music and platform dancing. The chairman was Dr. John Wetzel, of this city; the chief speakers were Arthur M. Lewis, Mrs. R. S. Lillie and Dr. York. A leading feature of the occasion was a rousing protest against the imprisonment and threatened deportation of John Turner. If possible I will get a copy of the resolutions for publication in Lucifer.

On the afternoon of Sunday, Jan. 31, another Paine meeting was held, in Justice Hall, Pythian Castle, at which the subject was "The Influence of Thomas Paine on the Twentieth Century," the leading speaker being Arthur S. Howe of this city.

This was the first meeting, as such, of the newly formed Free Platform Club, of which club I have spoken in previous Lucifers. At the close of the exercises in honor of the name and work of Paine, the meeting had a session for the more perfect organization of the club. The name selected is the Freethought Association. Meetings are to be held regularly every Sunday at 2:30 p. m. The meeting next Sunday will be opened with an address by Dr. John Wetzel. Seats and discussions free to all.

THE POSTAL CENSORSHIP.

The following is a synopsis of the speech made by Mrs. Scott Briggs at the meeting of protest held at Justice Hall, San Francisco, January 24:

"Many years ago George Francis Train published a paper in New York City. For publishing matter taken from the Bible he was arrested and imprisoned on the charges of blasphemy and obscenity. At this trial for blasphemy, which lasted several weeks, the sessions were called 'Train's matinees.' At the last session the judge asked the women to retire, as he was going to take up the subject of obscenity. As the women were leaving, one of them turned to the judge and said, 'To the pure all things are pure.'

"Mr. Train has passed on; at least, has left his mortal body. He may be with us now. When people leave the mortal it does not follow that they leave earth's conditions. They are still interested in friends and what is going on here. I knew Train well; he would shake hands with me after he had given up doing so with others, for, said he, 'you visited me in prison, and attended my trial.'

"He loved children, who gathered around him in the park, where he fed the birds, and talked to the children. A grand and spiritual man, much better than those who persecuted him.

"Ida Craddock—that brave, pure woman who wanted to make the race better—was hounded to her death by those who were far beneath her, for writing and publishing two small pamphlets called 'The Wedding Night' and 'Right Marital Living'—pamphlets which if read before marriage and lived up to, would soon show an improved humanity. That one should be imprisoned, as she was, for any offense, in such vile dens, filled with vermin; not a hook or nail on which to hang a garment; plumbing out of order; the cot having an iron bar across it so that one could not be comfortable in any position—should call for indignation meetings throughout our land.

"I corresponded with her before and after her incarceration, and have not presented the case to you in half its hideousness, as she detailed it to me. A pure woman who would have been a savior to humanity if allowed to continue her work—called to by higher intelligences.

"With a true knowledge of the laws of our being, the sex act which begets an immortal soul, entered into with a loved one for that purpose, or to quicken the spiritual, the intellectual, and to round out a grander manhood and womanhood—should not be looked upon as obscene, but as a sacramental act. When thus understood, men and women will not debase themselves as now, wasting their life forces, but will retain these forces to build up a better physical, intellectual and spiritual condition for themselves as well as to beget children who are worth raising—welcome, desired, love children.

"Not numbers but quality is needed, President Roosevelt to the contrary notwithstanding."

Several other addresses were made at the same meeting, synopses of which I hope to get for publication.

★ ★ ★

And now, after a very pleasant stay of nearly three months in San Francisco, I will probably start for Los Angeles within a week or ten days of this date, stopping at San Jose, Barstow and other intermediate points.

Having enjoyed the hospitality of friends in various parts of the city and at Oakland, I have made my headquarters for some weeks at the Hotel Argyle, McAlester street, opposite the City Hall. This hotel was chosen because of its central location, its cheerful, sunny, airy rooms, and now having been the guest of its gentlemanly proprietor, Mr. W. E. Brown, for several weeks, I can cordially recommend the Argyle to our friends and to the traveling public.

My address is still 1054 East Fourteenth street, Oakland, Cal.

M. HARMAN.

AN OPEN LETTER.

To the Editor of the San Francisco News Letter:

Your article of Dec. 5, ultimo, I have tried to read carefully. I have a fellow sympathy for you because only a few years ago I entertained substantially the beliefs you have expressed.

You place great stress on the restraining power of law and especially in the marriage relation. I once looked upon divorce as a contrivance of the devil, and, like you, I denounced such writers as M. Harman, Dr. Juliet Severance, Drs. Greer and Foote, and the scores of others who have had the courage to speak out against a public sentiment that is now so well known to set at defiance the laws of generation, if not justice, truth and mortality. I have no desire to enter into a controversy with you, because I judge from your article that intolerance is your predominating characteristic, and intolerance is always a sign of ignorance and weakness.

I have known Editor Harman for twelve years or more, and during this time he has been an earnest, serious student along the lines of race development. For more than a quarter of a century this thinker and writer you have debased yourself by calling "a reptile," has stood in the focus of public censure and abuse until at last there are millions who have come to see that he was right while the multitude was wrong. In fact, public sentiment has so radically changed that your article is now an anomaly.

Before you again begin your ravings against a writer who has probably spent more years than you have hours in the study of social science, I ask you to consider the following question: Is there any other reasonable basis for marriage except love? When you come to decide this question intelligently—in the light of the largest measure of human happiness and race development, then I believe your better nature will prompt you to take your pen in hand and write Editor Harman a note worded something as follows:

"My Dear Harman: In my recent criticism of your life work I must have been insane. For the wrong I have done you I can never fully atone—for we cannot obliterate the impressions

our thoughts have made—would to God that I could do so. You have accomplished more for race culture in your brave stand for woman's emancipation from sex slavery than the Church has ever done. I honor you for your long life of self-sacrifice and devotion to an ideal. Forgive me for my bigotry and intolerance. Since reading Grant Allen, Edward Carpenter, J. William Lloyd, Dr. Alice Stockham and other writers I have made the discovery that I was wrong and that you are right. Forgive me the wrong I have done you and may blessings come like snowflakes down upon your head. Fraternally, ————"

May this rough outline merely serve you as a suggestion.

HENRY E. ALLEN.

THE LAW AGAINST ANARCHISTS.

The morning after President McKinley was assassinated, there came a quick cry from the people all over the country against the liberty of speech. This impatient cry has since assumed definite expression in a law enacted by Congress against the admission into this country, among others, of persons who advocate the overthrow of organized government. As formulated, the law leaves to the American citizen all the freedom of speech which he has hitherto enjoyed, but it denies the same freedom to an alien seeking shelter on our shores.

Some weeks ago, John Turner, an Englishman, upon his arrival here, was seized by our government and sent to Ellis Island, where he is now detained as a prisoner. The objection against John Turner is that he advocates the abolition of all established governments, and is a believer in the Anarchist theory of society. A mass meeting was held the other day in Cooper Union, to protest against this action of the United States Government.

We have no sympathy with the propaganda of Anarchism. We believe in law and order at any price. Bad laws, or a wretchedly incompetent government, even, would not, in our opinion, justify a return to the wild and lawless state of barbarism. Of course the Anarchists do not advocate barbarism, but it would be difficult to preserve the benefits of civilization without an association of some kind. It is not sensible to go too far, under the plea that we are only following the logic of liberty to its conclusion. Even liberty has its limitations. "The excess of civilization," said the French philosopher, "is barbarism." It was our own Emerson who said "All appetites are in excess," and he could easily have added that all suffering is born of the exaggerated appetites of men. It would be foolish to argue that there can be no intemperance in liberty. That will depend upon what we mean by liberty. We are free to think and speak and act as we choose, provided there is a limitation upon our freedom; provided we do not prevent others from doing the same. The freedom of all, then, is a restraint upon the freedom of the individual. It could not very well be otherwise, unless we go back to the woods and throw civilization to the dogs. To protest against this social restraint upon our individual freedom—is to ask for too much freedom, or, as Emerson would say, "It is to have our appetites in excess."

But our government has erred, from the best motives, we are sure, for we are not of those who think that patriotism consists in always finding fault with one's country—our government has erred in seeking to exclude from the country, by force, an alien, for the opinions which he holds and the frankness with which he gives expression to them. What is John Turner's crime? He does not believe in government. But if we can allow people to deny God, why not extend the same courtesy to those who deny the king or the Republic? Would not the government become fearfully despotic, if it could suppress all criticism of itself? It is true of government as it is of men, that "he who will have no judge but himself, condemns himself." No one should be at liberty to preach violence as a means of making converts. Such a course would be the negation of liberty. But to suppress intellectual opinions, about or against the government, and the free expression of them, is a species of violence. If a government resorts to violence, it is sure to set a bad example to the people. Not only is it true that persecuting a cause helps to popularize it, but it also encourages the spirit of persecution. If gentleness and justice in rulers beget gentleness and justice in the people, violence in governors provokes violence in the governed. Nihilism is a child of Russian despotism. The best remedy for the evils flowing from liberty is—more liberty. We do not believe in the papacy any more than John Turner does in government, and we

should both be free to say so as long as neither of us advocates that either the papacy or the government should be forcibly deprived of its right to exist. We do not exclude the Turk nor the Russian for believing in the divine right of kings. Why should we deny the same asylum to an Englishman who believes in no government?

But this extreme and regrettable action on the part of our government is the effect of the violence and bloodshed indulged in by certain anarchists, who under the least provocation lose their heads, and forget that to kill in the name of liberty is not any the less a crime. To murder the representatives of the people, not in open war, but in secret and without warning, because they do not agree with us, is intolerably stupid as well as wicked. The cause of civilization is compromised by people whose appetites are in excess. They help to bring about a reversion of feeling in the minds of the people against the sacred cause of liberty. They alienate the sympathies of the friends of progress, and give to the croakers and charlatans, to the reactionists and conservatives, an opportunity to step in and block the movement of ideas.

We earnestly hope that our country will not follow the example of Russia. She is too great and too strong to be either fearful or suspicious. It is one of the glories of England, that during her South African war, pro-Boer meetings were held in London, at which the government was openly and vigorously denounced. It is also one of the glories of America, that during the war against the Filipinos, our people were at liberty to hold meetings to criticize the administration and to express sympathy with our enemies. Such freedom of speech would be impossible in Russia or Austria, or even in Germany. Only a government conscious of its strength could be so generous. Let not America lower herself in the esteem of her loyal children. It is suicidal to make war upon the liberty of speech. It is folly to persecute opinions.—*Liberal Review*.

WHO SHOULD DO THE CHOOSING?

If I have read *Lucifer* intelligently for the past seven or eight years, the prevailing opinion among sex reformers in regard to heredity and race improvement is that woman is the race builder, the race preserver, the transmitter of qualities; that she is the soil from which springs the race and from which the race receives its character, while man acts simply as a fertilizer for the "seed of the woman," an agent through which is begun the process of quickening, unfolding and developing the life which already existed in the seed, somewhat as the rain and sun act upon the grain in the soil of Mother Earth.

It seems to me an incongruity that, side by side with the contention that the mother, and not the father, transmits character to the child, we have *Lucifer's* proposed remedy for race deficiency—viz.: That woman be freed from all legal, social and religious interference in the matter of selecting a father for her child. Why not, instead, guarantee the man freedom from all restraint in the selection of a mother for his child, if it is from her, and not him, that the child is to receive the qualities that make for its own happiness and the betterment of society? It certainly will not be denied that the human male is equally interested with the female in the happiness and well-being of his progeny, and would be quite as likely as she to be governed by such desiderata in the choice of a sex-mate. If the mother is the soil whose character predetermines the strength or weakness, the perfection or imperfection of the fruit, then it would seem that any sort of a quickening agent, or father, would answer the essential purpose, but that the main care should be to select the right kind of soil, or mother, from which to grow this fruit.

I am only a student, and would be pleased to have some teacher clear up this incongruity of doctrine. If it is to the mothers we must look for race qualities, it would seem to be the proper thing for the man to seek out the woman who would be most likely to transmit desirable qualities to his children, and beget children of no other. On the other hand, if the traits and qualities of the father are going to prevail in the offspring, then Moses Harman is right in contending that the remedy for the manifold defects of our race is that woman be absolutely untrammelled in deciding what man may be the father of her children, and in refusing to bear children to one who is not her choice. If, however, it be granted that, as a rule, the child partakes equally of the traits, tendencies and qualities of both parents, then—what?

J. L. HICKS.

THE EVOLUTION OF MODESTY.

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 45.

daubing his face and body with clay and the blood of animals or of his slain human foes, he began to deck himself with the feathers of birds and the tails and hides of animals. Originally it is likely that he wore the hides of animals to make himself appear brave or terrible like the animals from which the hides were taken. He had no thought at that time of clothing his body from a sense of shame. But he must have discovered that the hides made him uncomfortably warm, and therefore, he ventured into colder climates where the hides actually served for clothing.

Custom long continued acquires the force of an imperative law. In climates where clothing was necessary to keep the body warm it often came to be believed that clothing was the proper covering for the body and that there was something disgraceful in being seen in a primitive state of nakedness. There have been found some exceptions to this rule, however. There are some Eskimo tribes which wear abundant clothing and yet men, women and children expose themselves naked in their huts with no feeling of shame.

The close association of clothing with modesty is shown by the fact that no matter how scanty it may be its removal causes, among some peoples, a sense of shame. The Andamanese women who wear merely a tail of leaves suspended from the back of the girdle are so modest that they will not renew them in the presence of one another. In ancient Samoa, Turner says, the only necessary garment for a man or woman was an apron of leaves, but they possessed so delicate a sense of propriety that even while bathing they wore a girdle of leaves or some other covering round the waist. On the other hand, among the Maoris, whose climate makes abundant clothing necessary, men and women, boys and girls, with no feeling of impropriety, strip themselves and swim together. Among the Japanese, also, until quite recently, it was a common thing for men and women to bathe together in a state of complete nudity. Western influence has checked this custom to a great extent, but it still prevails in many parts of Japan.

Captain Hunter, speaking of a Port Jackson woman who was absolutely nude, said: "There is such an air of innocence about her that clothing scarcely appears necessary."

H. H. Johnston observes of the Wachaga tribe: "We should be apt to call, from our point of view, their nakedness and almost unconsciousness of shame indelicate, but it is rather, when one gets used to it, a pleasing survival of the old innocent days when prurient thoughts were absent from the mind of man."

With all her own exalted notions of personal modesty, what refined and cultivated American woman would approve of the suggestion to drape Powers' statue of the Greek Slave?

In his work on "Wild Races of Southeastern India," page 349, Lewin says: "True modesty lies in the absence of thought on the subject."

The young girl who enters a hospital to become a trained nurse soon learns to assist in surgical operations performed by male physicians where the secret parts of the patient are exposed to view, and yet no thought of shame enters her mind. In her own personal conduct, however, she may be, and in fact almost invariably is, as strict an observer of the conventional code of modesty as any other young woman. So it is with many women who pose as artists' models. They have no thought of immodesty in the presence of the artist alone, but if a stranger should enter the room the model would endeavor to conceal herself. Before the stranger entered the room her nudity was a matter of which she was barely conscious, or at least to which she gave no thought of possible impropriety. The entrance of the stranger aroused her consciousness of her nudity and awakened her dormant sense of shame. But if exposure of the female person to a person of the opposite sex is in itself shameful, why should she feel no shame when posing for the artist and yet be overcome with confusion when she became aware that another man was looking at her? Is it not because with the arousing of her consciousness of her nudity there are many other complex emotions aroused which overwhelm her with confusion?

There was no immodesty in her posing for the artist. On the contrary there was absolute modesty, because modesty is a state of the mind, and is perfectly consistent with nudity so long as no feeling of impropriety is associated with the nudity.

She had become accustomed to posing for the artist and had become convinced that he entertained no disrespect for her on account of her nakedness. With regard to the opinion of the stranger, there was in her mind a feeling of uncertainty, to say the least, if not a positive conviction that he would regard her as immodest. Her modesty asserted itself, therefore, in the form of fear of his disapproval.

Strange as it may seem, this reluctance to being seen naked may exist among women who make no pretense to chastity. It is not uncommon among professional prostitutes. Lombroso, in "La Donna Delinquente," says prostitutes often make greater resistance to physical examination by physicians than is shown by respectable women. Yet it cannot be said that the prostitute therefore is more modest than her respectable sister, for, as I have said, modesty is a state of the mind, and excessive prudishness almost invariably is an indication of immodest thoughts. Dr. Holder mentions the reluctance to examination by physicians shown by women of the Crow tribe of Indians in Montana and adds: "Their modesty would not be so striking were it not that, almost to a woman, the females of this tribe are prostitutes."

It seems to me, however, that modesty is hardly the proper word to use in this instance. These women certainly have little modesty, but in place of it is an unreasonable prudishness. Somewhat related to it is the feeling of reluctance which many educated and refined women feel towards discussing sexual matters with their daughters and giving information concerning their natural functions. This feeling is inherited to some degree and is due in part to false education. It is gratifying to know that this false notion of modesty is fast disappearing among sensible women and that there is an increasing sentiment among them, in favor of giving their daughters full instructions regarding their natural functions. In fact, prudishness on such matters between mother and daughter has come to be regarded by many sensible people as being as absurd as the custom of a generation ago of avoiding the use of the word "leg," always calling it a "limb."

Dr. Helen Kennedy, after a study of 125 American high school girls, wrote: "Thirty-six girls in this high school passed into womanhood with no knowledge whatever, from a proper source, of all that makes them women. Thirty-nine were probably not much wiser, for they stated they had received some instruction, but had not talked freely on the matter. From the fact that the curious girl did not talk freely on what naturally interested her, it is possible she was put off with a few words as to personal care, and a reprimand for her curiosity. Less than half of the girls felt free to talk with their mothers of this most important matter."

With such false education, or lack of education, in girlhood, is it any wonder that so many women, sensible in other matters, regard prudishness as essential to modesty?

Lack of space in this little pamphlet necessarily compels a very superficial consideration of the phenomena of modesty, prudishness and shame. I have mentioned only some of their most apparent phases. That there is anything vile or unclean in the normal exercise of the sexual functions seems to me to be utterly repugnant to reason and the facts in nature. Out of this notion of villainess arises, not charming and captivating modesty, but its base counterfeit, prudishness. Genuine modesty is a factor which gives to love a great part of its piquancy and charm. It is as admirable in both woman and man as prudishness is disgusting and hideous. Stendhal, in "De l'Amour," says:

"It is modesty that gives to love the aid of imagination and, in so doing, imparts life to it. . . . To a timid and tender woman there ought to be no greater torture than to allow herself in the presence of a man something which she thinks she ought to blush at. I am convinced that a proud woman would prefer a thousand deaths. A slight liberty taken on the tender side by the man she loves gives a woman a moment of keen pleasure, but if he has the air of blaming her for it, or only of not enjoying it with transport, an awful doubt must be left in her mind. For a woman above the vulgar level there is, then, everything to be gained by very reserved manners. The play is not equal. She hazards against a slight pleasure, or against the advantage of appearing a little amiable, the danger of biting remorse, and a feeling of shame which must render even the lover less dear. An evening passed gaily and thoughtlessly, without thinking of what comes after, is dearly paid at this price. The sight of a lover with whom one fears that one has

had this kind of wrong must become odious for several days. Can one be surprised at the force of a habit the slightest inflections of which are punished with such atrocious shame?

"As to the utility of modesty, it is the mother of love. As to the mechanism of the feeling, nothing is simpler. The mind is absorbed in feeling shame instead of being occupied with desire. Desires are forbidden, and desires lead to actions. It is evident that every tender and proud woman—and these two things, being cause and effect, naturally go together—must contract habits of coldness which the people whom she disconcerts call prudery. The power of modesty is so great that a tender woman betrays herself with her lover rather by deeds than by words. The evil of modesty is that it constantly leads to falsehood."

Women are frequently blamed by men who cannot understand why they are reluctant to express freely their sentiments in love. This precaution is not only natural, but it meets the thorough approval of calm reason. Man is the natural wooer and it too often happens that he misrepresents his real feelings to the woman in order to win her. Where there is one man who afterwards respects the woman who shows a prompt willingness to yield to his advances, there are dozens, if not hundreds, who will despise her, or esteem her lightly, for it. Woman may have as much right as man to make the advances, yet the fact remains that the vast majority of men have no strong and lasting regard for women who are too easily won. Man, as a rule, does not appreciate a woman's love unless it requires some effort to win it. It is doubtless true also that there are some men who do not appreciate it even when they have won it through great effort. These facts have existed in nature through countless ages and from that experience repeated from generation to generation woman has acquired an inherited knowledge of the value of a show of resistance to the wooer. And that experience is still going on. Women are deceived and betrayed every day and others after them continue to give their confidence to men who are unworthy of it. Precaution, therefore, is as advisable for a woman in matters of the affections as it is natural.

In conclusion, and in support of my assertion that man is the natural wooer, I quote the following from an article on "Love and Death," written by the eminent churchman and scientist, Dr. St. George Mivart, who was excommunicated from the Roman Catholic Church, shortly before his death, by Cardinal Vaughan:

"For untold ages our animalcules lived and increased by fission in perpetual vigor, sexless and immortal. But in time some pairs would meet and blend into one, gaining strength and regeneration, by this process, which is known in science as 'conjugation,' and which is the initiation of the sexual process, or first incarnation of Aphrodite. Her second came to be when the conjugating cells, at first similar, became what we call male and female. It was advantageous that there should be these two elements; one of larger bulk and quiescent habit, that seeks not, but needs to be sought; the other minute and ceaselessly active till it can find one of the larger kind wherein to merge its being secure, in the extinction of its separate self, its supreme nirvana.

"This distinction between the 'seekers' and 'sought' pervades organic nature. It is found in multitudes of fungi and myriads of sea weeds, especially in those lovely ones (the *Floridæ*) which exhibit such complex arrangement of their sexual adjuncts. It is found in ferns, and in flowers of all kinds. It is found in conifers—fertilized in a very Danaë shower of gold—whose pollen grains are wafted by the wind to the female cells tranquilly nesting amidst the fir-cones' scales. Orchids and many other flowers bribe insects, by well-filled cups of nectar, to bear unwittingly the seeker they would welcome. Amongst many lowly animals the female appears as an almost motionless parasite, while the male wanders in search of her, a restless Cælebs. Amongst higher forms we see the stag pursue the flying hind, and birds seek to gain a mate by song and many a quaint display of courting plumage. It is the male which is normally the seeker, from the lowest insect to the young man, carefully appareled, who crosses the ballroom to seek the partner he desires."

A large portion of the noblest and most valuable moral teaching has been the work, not only of men who did not know, but of men who knew and rejected, the Christian faith.—Mill.

"WHO IS THE ENEMY?"

Hugh O. Pentecost writes thus to Edwin C. Walker about the latter's new work, "Who Is the Enemy: Anthony Comstock or You?" "Your pamphlet is a strong discussion of the question at issue that one could give to a conservative friend with some hope that he might read it through."

Dr. R. W. Shufeldt, biologist, author of several scientific works and of more than seven hundred articles on medicine, travel, science, sexual problems and other subjects, writes to E. C. Walker: "I thank you very much indeed for the copy you sent me of your valuable pamphlet, 'Who Is the Enemy: Anthony Comstock or You?' I have read it from cover to cover with the utmost satisfaction and unqualified approval. It is one of the best and strongest things you have put out, and I am with you solid in both the letter and spirit of it. I prize the copy most highly." Ask for table of contents and specimen pages of "Who Is the Enemy?" or send 20 cents to this office for the pamphlet.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

KAREZZA.

SCIENCE OF MARRIAGE.

A godsend to every wife—a joy to every husband.

This work brings peace into homes disrupted by inharmony in the sexual relation. Dr. A. B. Stockham advises a practice which leads to individual liberty and to deeper love between husband and wife.

Dr. F. G. Welch: "After a personal trial of its teachings, I want to thank you for a great service to humanity."

Rev. George E. Ranshaw: "Out of a beautiful and ennobling experience, I can say, I KNOW."

Gives a high ideal of the marital relation and teaches control of the Fecundating Power.

J. A. Smalley, M. D.: "I have received more actual benefit from the practice of KAREZZA teachings than from all other books on Sexual Science."

A. B. Franklin, M. D.: "KAREZZA does more than any other single thing to make marriage a perpetual courtship."

LEVANT CLOTH, POSTPAID, \$1.

STOCKHAM PUB. CO., 70 Dearborn St., Suite 72, Chicago.

MEN, WOMEN, AND CHANCE.

BY WILLIAM FLATT.

Containing two tales: The Ascent to the Heights, and Blind Men and Seeing. Well printed on heavy paper and artistically bound in cloth; gilt top, rough edges. Price 75c.

STOCKHAM PUB. CO., 70 Dearborn St., Suite 72, Chicago.

WOMAN AND HER RELATION TO THE CHURCH, OR CANON LAW FOR WOMEN.

BY HARRIET M. CLOSZ.

A succinct statement of the position to which women were doomed by the Church Fathers and authorities. Every woman should possess a copy. Price, 10c. M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton St., Chicago, Ill.

THE PRODIGAL DAUGHTER; OR THE PRICE OF VIRTUE.

By Rachel Campbell. Together with Legal Wifehood, by Lucinda B. Chandler; Life's Gifts, by Olive Schreiner, and Marriage—What It Was and Is, and Will the Coming Woman Marry? Price, 25c. M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton St., Chicago.

ISOLA; OR, THE DISINHERITED.

A drama in six acts. By Lady Florence Dixie. With Foreword by George Jacob Holyoake. Colored frontispiece. Cloth, \$1; postage 7c.

STOCKHAM PUB. CO., 70 Dearborn St., Suite 72, Chicago.

MISCELLANEOUS.

A PRIVATE MATERNITY HOME

Or Lying-In Hospital for Women During Pregnancy and Confinement. Especially adapted to classes that wish to avoid publicity. We provide a home for the infant by adoption if desired. For particulars and terms give description of case, and address C. S. WOOD, M. D., Suite 63, 119 LaSalle St., Chicago, Ill.

AT LAST I HAVE THEM!

Cabinet photographs of Ida C. Craddock, victim of the Postal Inquisition. We cannot sell her books, but you may have her picture and judge for yourselves why she incurred the enmity of the Censor. Two styles, 30c each, two for 50c. Address EDWIN C. WALKER, 244 W. 143d St., New York, N. Y.

WANTED—100 women to study medicine or midwifery. Next term begins January 1, 1904. College of Medicine and Surgery, 245 Ashland Blvd., Chicago, Ill. DR. FLORENCE DRESSLER, Secretary. (Dept. A.)

BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL CARDS.

OTTO WETTSTEIN,

THE LIBERAL MAIL-ORDER JEWELER.

Now permanent at No. 110 N. Kensington Ave., La Grange, Cook Co., Ill. Can save you 10 to 20 per cent on Watches, Diamonds or anything in the Jeweler's Line. Write me and receive prices and my great little tract, "Theism in the Crucible," free.

J. H. GREER, M. D.,

52 DEARBORN ST., CHICAGO.

Office Hours—0 a. m. to 6 p. m.; Wednesdays and Saturdays, 9 a. m. to 8 p. m.; Sundays, 9 a. m. to 12 m.
Telephone, Randolph 42.

DR. OGILVIE A. RICE,

DENTIST.

1556 MILWAUKEE AVE., COR. WESTERN, CHICAGO.
Telephone West 141.

PHILIP G. PEABODY,
ATTORNEY AND COUNSELLOR AT LAW.
15 COURT SQUARE, ROOM 61.
BOSTON, MASS.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

EVERY WOMAN SHOULD OWN

TOKOLOGY.

A COMPLETE HEALTH GUIDE.

BY ALICE B. STOCKHAM, M. D.

Teaches possible painless pregnancy and parturition, giving full, plain directions. Treats of diseases of women and children; contains practical teachings on Change of Life, limiting offspring, etc.

Lizzie N. Armstrong writes: "If I knew I were to be the mother of innumerable children it would have no terrors for me, so great is my confidence in the science of Tokology." Dr. C. B. Willis: "Tokology is doing more for women than all other books put together."

CLOTH, PREPAID, \$2.25; LEATHER, \$2.75.

STOCKHAM PUB. CO., 70 Dearborn St., Suite 72, Chicago.

VICE: ITS FRIENDS AND ITS FOES.

BY EDWIN C. WALKER.

Contents—Brotherhood of Man; The Recognition of Facts; Folly of "For Men Only"; Definition of Vice; Horrors of Prostitution; Abnormal Sexuality; Errors of Fathers, Mothers and Teachers; Persecution Does Not Reform; Prostitution and the Crusaders; The "Spoiling of the Heavens"; What Are the Effects of Raids and Crusades? The Economic Side of the Problem; Party Politics in Vice Crusading; In What Does Prostitution Consist? Some Causes of Prostitution; Two Kinds of Prostitution Compared; The Opponents of Divorce; "Purifying" the Tenements; Action for Advanced Women. With Appendix: The Wanderings of a Spirit; Our Fair Civilization; The Folly and Cruelty of It All. Price 15c.

M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton St., Chicago, Ill.

LOVE'S COMING OF AGE.

BY EDWARD CARPENTER.

A treatise on Sexual Science and Marriage, rich in thought and strong in expression. Emphatically a book for the thinker.

Carpenter holds that woman's freedom is based upon economics; she must be independent financially that she may not be forced to sell herself in or out of marriage. He also makes a strong plea for a motherhood of freedom and thoughtful preparation.

AMERICAN EDITION, CLOTH, PREPAID, \$1.

STOCKHAM PUB. CO., 70 Dearborn St., Suite 72, Chicago.

RELIGION AND RATIONALISM.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF EACH TO HUMAN LIBERTY.

BY E. C. WALKER.

The religionist, fancying that he has the whole truth, is logically opposed to investigation, and he appeals to physical force to arrest the discovery of new truths. What Rationalism is, and how many believe themselves Freethinkers who are only unbelieving or disgruntled religionists. The necessity for separate organization and a division of labor among reformers. The Secular Union. Important facts and arguments in a compact form. Price 5c.

M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton St., Chicago, Ill.

CREATIVE LIFE.

A BOOK FOR YOUNG GIRLS.

BY ALICE B. STOCKHAM, M. D.

A timely and important message not found in text books. Every girl seeks and should have this true, plain and practical knowledge. One writes: "Thank you, thank you, dear Doctor, for the plain but beautiful thoughts. Womanhood, motherhood and life have new meanings. You ennoble your theme." Prepaid, 25c.

STOCKHAM PUB. CO., 70 Dearborn St., Suite 72, Chicago.

THE STRIKE OF A SEX.

A NOVEL BY GEORGE N. MILLER.

FORTIETH THOUSAND.

"The Strike of a Sex" is a fascinating novel bearing upon the sexual relations. It is a bold protest against the customary life of most married people, and at the same time a prophecy of happier conditions between man and wife. Prepaid, 25c.

STOCKHAM PUB. CO., 70 Dearborn St., Suite 72, Chicago.

WHAT THE YOUNG NEED TO KNOW.

A PRIMER OF SEXUAL RATIONALISM.

BY E. C. WALKER.

"Let us cease to be ashamed of what makes us men, of what makes us women, of what gives us the kisses of lovers and the encircling arms of babes." Paper covers; 42 large pages. Price 10c.

M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton St., Chicago, Ill.

"PERSONAL EXPERIENCES OF TWO AMERICAN ANTI-VIVISECTIONISTS IN VARIOUS COUNTRIES."

BY PHILIP G. PEABODY.

With an Appendix by Col. Robert G. Ingersoll. Reduced from 25c to 15c. Apply to PHILIP G. PEABODY, 15 Court Square, Boston, Mass.

PRIESTLY CELIBACY.

By Prof. A. L. Rawson. Together with The Incoherence of Transition, by E. C. Walker; Motherhood in Freedom, by Moses Harman; The Greatest Sin (an allegory), by R. B. Kerr, and Jealousy, the Foe of Freedom, by Oscar Rotter. Price, 25c. M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton St., Chicago.

THE RIGHTS OF CHILDREN.

By R. B. Kerr. Together with What Are Women Here For? by E. B. Foote, Jr., M. D.; The New Martyrdom, by Lillian Harman, and The Will, from the French of Guy de Maupassant. Price, 25c. M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton St., Chicago.

A TALE OF THE STRASSBURG GEESSE.

By R. B. Kerr. Together with The Strike of the Strassburg Geesse, by C. W. Coolidge; A Traveler's Tale, by R. B. Kerr; The Cat's Story, by Emilie Zola. Price, 25c. M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton St., Chicago.

1007

If these figures correspond with the number printed on the wrapper of your Lucifer, your subscription expires with this number. If a copy of Lucifer fails to reach you, please order by number or date.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

HILDA'S HOME.

A STORY OF WOMAN'S EMANCIPATION.

BY ROSA GRAUL.

With Macaulay, Rosa Graul would say: "The cure for the evils of liberty is more liberty." Hence she has no fears that under Freedom the Home and the Family would cease to exist, or that woman would be less loving and lovable, or that man would be less manly and honorable. On the contrary, she maintains that only in the soil and atmosphere of freedom is it possible for true womanhood and manhood to live and flourish.

426 pages. Cloth, \$1; paper, 50c.

M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton St., Chicago, Ill.

MARRIAGE IN FREE SOCIETY.

BY EDWARD CARPENTER.

One of the best short works on the subject. A charming little gift book. "Love is doubtless the last and most difficult lesson that humanity has to learn; in a sense it underlies all the others. Perhaps the time has come for the modern nations when, ceasing to be children, they may even try to learn it."

DAINTILY PRINTED. PREPAID, 25c.

STOCKHAM PUB. CO., 70 Dearborn St., Suite 72, Chicago.

OUR WORSHIP OF PRIMITIVE SOCIAL GUESSES.

BY E. C. WALKER.

Contents—Love and Law; The Moloch of the Monogamic Ideal; The Continuity of Race-Life, and Tyranny; Food and Sex Fallacies, a Criticism; When Men and Women Are and When They Are Not Varietists; The New Woman: What is She? What Will She Be? The State Hiding Behind Its Own Mistakes; Bishop Potter's Opinion of Divorce; Love: Its Attraction and Expression; Is She an Honest Girl? Lloyd, Platt, and the Pitiful Facts; Social Radicals and Parentage; Anthropology and Monogamy; Love and Trust Versus Fear; Reflections Upon Reading William Platt's "Women, Love and Life." Price 15c.

M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton St., Chicago, Ill.

A CITYLESS AND COUNTRYLESS WORLD.

AN OUTLINE OF PRACTICAL CO-OPERATIVE INDIVIDUALISM.

BY HENRY OLERICH.

Regarded by many persons as a more interesting and consistent economic reform novel than Bellamy's "Looking Backward." Bound in red silk with gold title. Nearly 450 pages. Paper, 50c; cloth, \$1.

M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton St., Chicago, Ill.

GOVERNMENT ANALYZED.

BY JOHN R. KEISO.

Contents—Derivations and Definitions of Political Terms; Various Forms of Government; General Principles of Government; Origin of Government; Declaration of Independence; Articles of Confederation; Defects of the Confederation; Formation of the Constitution of the United States; Taxation; Tariff or Protection; War Punishments; Marriage; Religion; Prohibition; Money; What a Government Should Be.

519 pages. Cloth binding somewhat damaged, and reduced from \$1.50 to 50c.

M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton St., Chicago, Ill.

ORIGIN OF THE FAMILY, PRIVATE PROPERTY, AND THE STATE.

BY FREDERICK ENGELS.

Chapter titles: Prehistoric Stages: The Family; The Iroquois Gens; The Grecian Gens; Origin of the Attic State; Gens and State in Rome; The Gens Among Celts and Germans; The Rise of the State Among Germans.

217 pages; bound in cloth. Price 60c; postage 5c.

STOCKHAM PUB. CO., 70 Dearborn St., Suite 72, Chicago.

THE STORY OF IJAIN;

OR, THE EVOLUTION OF A MIND.

By Lady Florence Dixie. With Epilogue by "Saladin" (W. Stuart Ross), and four illustrations beautifully printed in colors. Price \$1; postage 8c.

STOCKHAM PUB. CO., 70 Dearborn St., Suite 72, Chicago.

THE CURSE OF MATERNITY.

From the French of Henry Fèvre. Together with How to Escape the Curse, by Jonathan Mayo Crane; Woman's "Duty" to Bear Children, by E. C. Walker; True and False Morality, by C. L. James; and Love's Law, by William Francis Barnard. Price, 25c. M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton St., Chicago.

THE ABOLITION OF MARRIAGE.

By John Beverly Robinson. Together with Isabel's Intention, by Mariette; Reminiscences of Berlin Heights, by A. Warren, and The Sexes and Love in Freedom, by Oscar Rotter. Price, 25c. M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton St., Chicago.

THE UNWOMANLY WOMAN.

By Lizzie M. Holmes. Together with That Great Fraud, Yeleep Society, by Moses Hull; Virgin Soil, by George Egerton, and Normal Sexual Action, by Ernest Winne. Price, 25c. M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton St., Chicago.

RULED BY THE TOMB. A discussion of Freethought and Free Love. By Orford Northcote. Price, 10c. M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton St., Chicago.

INSTITUTIONAL MARRIAGE. From the viewpoint of an exiled Martian. By M. Harman. Price, 5c. M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton St., Chicago.

LIBERTY: Political, Religious, Social and Moral. By A. F. Tindall. Price, 5c. M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton St., Chicago.

THE REVIVAL OF PURITANISM, by E. C. Walker. Price, 10c. M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton St., Chicago.

LUCIFER. Bound volumes, \$1.75; unbound, \$1. M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton St., Chicago.

THE COMING WOMAN, by Lillie D. White. Price, 5c. M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton St., Chicago.